



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,061	02/11/2002	Donald C. Soltis JR.	10016639-1	6701

7590 04/22/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAN, DANIEL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2183

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/074,061

Applicant(s)

SOLTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Pan

Art Unit

2183

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: 6.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 7-16.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Attached corrected copy Page 3.

DANIEL H. PAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to the remark of rejection of "102(b) in page 2, lines 1-5, Examiner affirmed 102(b) is correct (see attached correction copy). The response has been fully considered with following comments: as per applicant's argument in page 3 on 04/08/05, Panwar taught: claim 1) a first [f5][f4] and second register [f4] identifiers overlap in hazard detection logic across two or more rows of the register file (for hazard detection, see the dependency of f5 on f4 and f5 in col.3, lines 64-67, col.4, lines 1-14, see also how the f4 and f5 aliased into f4 in fig.1B, the overlap is the f4 register number, see also other aliased registers); claim 8) determined data hazard (dependency) within the register file by processing on or more of the register identifiers (see the register numbers f4 and f5 in fig.2, for hazard detection, see col.3, lines 64-67, col.4, lines 1-14, claim 11) evaluating matches between entries (see f4 and f5, see fig.1B) of the register ID file in the hazard logic without distinguishing between common aliased entries (f4 and f5, see both the f4 and f5 aliased to f4 double precision of the register file; 4) determined data hazard by matching register ids (f4,f5) within the hazard logic (see fig.2, see also the dependency of f5 on f4 and f5); claim 16) aliasing two or more groups of registers of a stacked register file to one group of register IDs within the hazard detection logic (see f4 and f5 aliased with f4, see also f6 and f7 aliased with f6 as another group, see f4, f6, f8 so on for one group IDs, see the rest of the groups, such as f6,f7, in fig.1B). The Furthermore, Panwar did teach the evaluation of entries of register ID file (see the determination or evaluation of the dependency of f5 with f4 and f5 in col.3, lines 64-67, col.4, lines 1-14, see fig.s1A and B for each entry of register id file). As to Dye reference, Dye was used for showing the teaching of 128 registers, and the reasons for using Dye were already set forth in page 6, paragraph 24 of the last office action on 02/22/05, therefore, it will not be repeated herein. Examiner's position has been set forth clearly in this action. However, Examiner will entertain and welcome applicant's feedback.

Added to PTO-L-303

Application/Control Number: 10/074,061

Page 3

Art Unit: 2183

11. ladonato et al. (5,371,684), Clift (6,598,149), Wang et al. (5,826,055) were already cited to the applicant in a previous action, therefore, copies are not provided.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 8-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1,3,8-12,15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) ^{and (b)} as being anticipated by Panwar (5,884,070).

D. P.
04/18/05

14. As to claim 1, Panwar disclosed at least :

- a) identifying a first group of registers within register file (see the register ID of odd numbered registers fig.1A);
- b) aliasing the first group of registers to first identifiers (see the odd numbered register id and registers in fig.1B);
- c) detecting data hazard (dependencies) associated with the e first identifiers (see col.3, lines 65-67, col.4, lines 1-14, see col.8, lines 17-54)